DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 406 UD 031 559

AUTHOR Fenwick, Leslie T.
TITLE A History of the Constructs IQ and Race: Putting "The Bell Curve" in Perspective.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Book Review (9th, Tuscaloosa, AL, February 1995).
PUB TYPE Book/Product Reviews (072) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Blacks; Child Development; Cognitive Ability; *Educational History; Equal Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Ethnic Groups; Genetics; *Intelligence; Intelligence Quotient; Intelligence Tests; Nature Nurture Controversy; *Racial Differences; *Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; *Bell Curve (Herrnstein and Murray)

ABSTRACT

"The Bell Curve" by Richard Herrnstein and Charles E. Murray has created a great deal of controversy because of its assertion that the key to explaining inequality and social problems in the United States is stratification by a unitary entity called intelligence, or cognitive ability, as measured by the intelligence quotient (IQ). Their position is in line with the persistent and influential myth of black or African intellectual inferiority. It is asserted that the book is a rehashing of the scientific racism that has influenced American political and economic thought. The most difficult and intransigent of racialist attitudes in Western thought have been generated in the African-Anglo-American triangle. As social scientists, Herrnstein and Murray believe in the relationship between IQ and genes. They join those who still believe that certain groups of people are more intelligent than other groups of people based on ethnic/racial and social class affiliations. Research on the physical precocity and early cognitive development of black children has been ignored by Herrnstein, Murray, and their supporters. A list of resources, which includes studies of early child development, is presented to supply information to counter the myths and scientism of "The Bell Curve" and its advocates. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A History of the Constructs IQ and Race: Putting The Bell Curve in Perspective.
Leslie T. Fenwick

ED 405 406

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Leslie T. Fenwick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

UD031559

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD

A History of the Constructs IQ and Race: Putting The Bell Curve in Perspective

Good evening. I bring greetings from the faculty, students and staff of Clark Atlanta University to you, the Stillman College and Tuscaloosa communities. Thank you for your generous invitation, kind words, and warm welcome!

The reason for our assembling here this evening both delights and concerns me. I am delighted because Stillman College has joined the league of colleges and universities nationally who have provided an academic forum for the discussion of this work, The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life. You have stepped forward as an academic community. Rather than act in complicity by silence, you have provided a forum for this charlatanism that masquerades as science. And so I am delighted.

I am concerned because here in 1995, 5 years from a new millennium, we are still debating the notion that certain groups of people are more intelligent than other groups of people based on ethnic/racial and social class affiliations. I am *disturbed* because the nation's most preeminent institution, an internationally acknowledged center of higher learning, Harvard, seems to have a penchant for producing scholars and so called scholarship that does not take us to a higher ground, but indeed leads us down much worn, convoluted, and backward paths even when the path to light is less obscured and holds more promise for many. I am *disturbed* because the president of Rutgers University, a leader and academician at another of these institutions of higher learning is dangerously confused. Recently, as you know, Frances Lawrence was quoted as saying:

> "The average SAT for African Americans is 750. Do we set standards in the future so that we don't admit anybody with the national test? Or do we deal with a disadvantaged population that doesn't have that genetic hereditary background to have a higher average?"

I am *disturbed* because University of Florida's (Gainesville) president John Lombardi, endorsed Lawrence's remarks calling Lawrence "a smart guy" and his racist comment " a slip of the tongue." I am *disturbed* because the President of The Ohio State University, three years ago, in response to a query about why no African American was

UD03/559

being considered for the position of provost, stated that the search committee (which conducted a *national* search) could find no black person qualified to be provost of the university.

Finally, I am *disturbed* that this book, The Bell Curve by the late Richard Herrnstein and Charles E. Murray has bounced between numbers 3 and number 10 on the New York Times best seller list when *truly scientific* work is denied a voice and such popularity. The adage "ignorance is bliss" seems untrue here. More accurately ignorance has proved both popular and lucrative.

I am *disturbed* that you and I are required to use our talents, voice, time, energies, pens, computers and other resources engaging in this *scholarship of refutation* when all of our resources would be more appropriately expended on the *scholarship of creation.*

I am *disturbed* that Murray has had the ear and confidence of this country's leadership having been a favored son of former President Reagan, endorsed by former Secretary of Education William Bennett, and having addressed this year's freshman class in Congress. There is a disturbingly clear message about the direction of our country and its people.

Centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson was asked about the poetry of Phillis Wheatley providing proof that skin color is *not* linked with enlightenment and mental endowment. Jefferson replied nonsensically that Phillis Wheatley was "not a poet... The compositions published under her name are below the dignity of criticism." History has proved Jefferson wrong in this regard. History has shown that Herrnstein and Murray's treatise *is* beneath the dignity of criticism.

But criticize we must, otherwise our silence is complicity. Our criticism must be lucid and aggressive or yet be perceived and packaged as the whining of a scientifically proven underdog.

In fairness to this book and you, there are numerous fronts on which to critique this work. Indeed, Howard University, at the urging of the National Urban League, held a symposium, broadcast in January on C-SPAN in which psychometricians (intelligence testers), a zoologist, biologists, psychologist, Education Testing Service (ETS the

organization out of Princeton which produces out the SAT, GRE etc.) personnel, and educators exposed the glaring fallacies, statistical gamesmanship and eugenic disposition of this book. I urge you to view the panel discussion. It is a critical expose'.

Each of the disciplines represented here this evening, in you the faculty and students, could be used to expose the fallacies of Herrnstein and Murray's work. With time constraints in mind, I have designed in review around four sections. Section 1 will give an overview of the history of the construct, I.Q. Section 2 will provide an overview of the construct race. Section 3 will cite prominent research, not cited by Herrnstein and Murray, about the intelligence of African/African American children. And Section 4 will conclude with a list of resources available to you to counter the myths and scientism of Herrnstein and Murray and their fraudulent predecessors and contemporary peers.

As their title implies, Herrnstein and Murray contend that the key to explaining all inequality and all social problems in the United States is stratification by a unitary entity called intelligence, or "cognitive ability" as measured, of course in I.Q. This claim has surfaced repeatedly over the past 75 years to be refuted each time as unfounded class, race and gender prejudice. Herrnstein and Murray see rigid I.Q. stratification operating through every sphere of social life. And they put two district wrinkles on this long running fantasy. First, is Herrnstein's old claim that I.Q. stratification is becoming even more intense in a postindustrial world that requires cognitive ability over all else. As democratic institutions have succeeded in leveling the playing field, differences of individual merit become all the more pronounced. Second, the demonic duo, as Adolf Reed, Jr. calls them, backs coyly away from the implications of their eugenic convictions (no doubt because people do remember slavery and Nazi death camps). Instead of directly endorsing extermination, mass sterilization and selective breeding - which nonetheless implicitly shadow the book - they propose a world in which people will be slotted into places that fit their cognitive ability, in which each of us will be respected for what we actually are and can be (which will amount to more or less the same thing). Of course, we'll need to have controls to make sure that dullards do what is best for them and don't get out of line. But that is a

necessary price to stem the present tide of social breakdown. We shall, that is, have to destroy democracy to save it, in the end.

There is a proverb "to wash an Aethop white". The phrase is ancient, the proverb used to illustrate impossibility. It probably originated with Aesop, one of whose fables used the image of scrubbing an Aethiopian to demonstrate the permanence of nature. In Latin the proverb was "you wash an Aethiopian; why labor in vain?" The expression was quite common in Elizabethan times; indeed, it was a popular figure of speech until the early nineteenth century. It took various forms in English "you wash an Aethiop, you labor in vain as to scrub an Ethiop", "as impossible as to wash an Aethiop white." As with other figures of speech this one tells as much about those who used it as about what they sought to describe.

I mention this proverb in this context for a reason. The myth of black/African intellectual inferiority has been both *persistent* and influential in Western thought. Not only do racialist attitudes have a long history but they are peculiarly tough specimens to eradicate. The most difficult and intransigent of these attitudes in the Western stream of thought have been the attitudes toward race that have been generated in the African-Anglo-American triangle. One need only read W. E. B. DuBois' The World and Africa to understand that much excellent scholarship has been devoted to the institution of slavery, the slave trade, imperialism, colonialism and their portentous consequences for the history of the world since about since about 1500. I, personally, have become more and more convinced that the feelings and attitudes of superiority and inferiority generated by the experiences of colonialism and slavery may be the most profound heritage of ill will that the world will have to face up to in the encroaching future (a perusal of Derrick Bell's Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism is clear in this regard).

But what does this Ethiopian being subjected to a stupefying and purposeless scrubbing have to do with our objective here today? More than anything else, Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray's The Bell Curve is a testament to the intransigence of a peculiar line of so-called scholarship and a depressing commentary on the temper of our times.

Rather than being a bold, apolitic (if there is such an endeavor) foray into the frontiers of science; rather than offering up a disturbing yet fresh perspective on intelligence and race as Murray has cleverly suggested; what the authors of the Bell Curve have done is simply provide a rehash of the scientific racism that has long influenced American political and economic thought. **By all accounts, The Bell Curve holds no new arguments or compelling data.**

The father of this scientific racism and the poster boy for what became the eugenics movement was the 18th century economist Thomas Malthus, who viewed any form of welfare, public health or sanitary reform as immoral and unpatriotic, and as going against the laws of God and nature. By raising war, famine and disease to the level of natural law, Malthus explained, and others justified, human misery as checks on overpopulation. The world of men was still rationale even if it lacked humanitarian virtues. But scientific racism was truly defined at the end of the last century by the work of Herbert Spencer, creator of social Darwinsim, and of Sir Frances Dalton, Darwin's cousin and founder of modern eugenics - a sort of race hygiene in which the propagation of so called pure Nordic strains is encouraged over those of other people. The poor, the weak, the downtrodden, the stupid, the lazy must be allowed to die off (Read Essays on the Principle of Population as It Affects the Future Improvement of Society).

If medieval Christianity made poverty a virtue and Calvin made it a vice, Herbert Spencer made it a symptom of racial degeneracy. In the interest of progress, Spencer justified a system that would allow the strong to take from the weak and the smart to take from both. Government should not interfere in the struggle. Therefore, he opposed tarriffs, poor laws, state banking, public education, and all forms of government regulation of industry. The good society for Spencer was a highly competitive social system which maximized individualism and minimized collective social action. He believed that out of such a social system would evolve the German philosopher Nietzche's superman who would be strong, intelligent and altruistic (one wonders how, especially of the latter character trait!).

> In true Spencerian tradition, Herrnstein and Murray (on pages 519-520 write: People in the bottom quartile of intelligence are becoming not just increasingly expendable in economic terms; they will sometime in the not-too-distant future become a net drag... Perhaps, a revolution in teaching technology will drastically increase the productivity returns to education for people in the lowest quartile of intelligence, overturning our pessimistic forecast. But there are no harbingers of any such revolution as we write. And unless such a revolution occurs, all the fine rehtoric about - 'investing in human capital' to 'make America competitive in the 21st century' is not going to be able to overturn this reality. **For many people there is nothing they can learn that will repay the cost of teaching.**
> Herrnstein and Murray continue on page 536:
>
> In figure after figure in Ch. 16, the pattern was consistent. The prevalence of the social maladies we reviewed was strikingly concentrated in the bottom I.Q. deciles.

The authors add that as they "move up the I.Q. scale these problems of out-of-wedlock births, poverty, and individuals providing poor environments for their children decrease". In Ch. 22, "A Place for Everyone" the authors query:

> How should polity deal with the twin realities that people differ in intelligence for reasons that are not their fault, and that intelligence has a powerful bearing on how well people do in life?

Here, the authors are their most clever as they proceed to espouse a kind of tough love policy for those in society's lower strata who have gotten in their fix because of their ancestors low I.Q. scores.

The idea that the stronger is biologically and scientifically justified in destroying the weaker has as much appeal to the struggles within as between nations. One simply says that the existing pyramid of wealth and power is the outcome of valuable heredity concentrating at the top and the biologically inferior classes settling further and further down. The more liberal trend among the social Darwinists admits that enough good genes are left in the lower classes to give rise to the occasional valuable individuals who should be permitted to climb the social ladder.

Again, you must listen to Herrnstein and Murray as they blame everything from behavior problems, temperaments, illegitimacy, unemployment, divorce, the school dropout

rate, poor parenting skills, low birth weight, and the odds for doing time in jail on I.Q. Never mind the commonly acknowledged perils of negotiating racist, classist, sexist, and capitalist structures (Herrnstein and Murray would do well to read bell hooks' commentary on this).

Now is time for the uplifting part of Herrnstein and Murray's permutations. They state:

> The great bulk of the American population is amply equipped, in their cognitive resources and in other personal characteristics, to find a valued place in society. We must emphasize that, because for hundreds of pages we have focused on people at the two tails of the bell curve. Now is good time to recall the people in the broad part of the curve, between the extremes.

When the reader returns to page 279 and views the graph showing the Black and White I.Q. distributions much more is made clear. In Herrnstein and Murray's chart when they refer to the "great bulk of the American population..." they are referring to almost all whites, obviously. Nonetheless, there are a portion of whites who would need to be slotted into appropriate positions given their cognitive deficits, too. One wonders why Murray and Herrnstein did no superimpose over the Black/White distribution, one of Asians or their prized most intelligent ethnic group Jews.

Just as Thorndike did in the 1920's, Herrnstein and Murray assert that between money making, intelligence and moral character there exists a positive correlation. I quote:

> It seems entirely safe to predict that the world will get better treatment by trusting its fortunes to its 95-or-99 percentile intelligences than it would get by itself.

It was too soon for Edward L. Thorndike to know the lessons of Nazi Germany but Herrnstein and Murray know it all too well. You will please remember that 10 of the 14 who decided on the extermination of some 12 million or so people in Nazi Germany held Ph.D.s. A striking treatise against Herrnstein and Murray's "cognitive elites".

Of course, Herrnstein and Murray's positive correlations of wealth, morality, intelligence, and social power disturb few on the upper end of the power structure. And

why should even middle America be upset to find that science had substaintiated the fact that the better off persons of the world in the long run are more clean, decent, just, law abiding, committed, and even kind.

One of the most significant analyses of the implications of testing is made by historian Clarence Karier in Shaping the American Educational State, 1900 to the Present. Karier's book is both an analysis of the movement and an anthology of original articles. Karier argues that the use of intelligence testing as a means of establishing a meritocracy became another method of justifying social-class differences and racial discrimination. Now, as Herrnstein and Murray suggest, the wealth of the rich could be justified on the grounds of innate levels of intelligences. Indeed, psychologists at the time and our authors now, argued that the rich deserved to be rich because they are more intelligent than the poor. In Karier's words:

> The hierarchical social class system was effectively maintained then as it is today, not so much by the sheer force of power and violence, but by the ideological beliefs of people within the system. One method of getting people to accept their position in society was to convince them that the particular position they held reflected their individual merit. The measurement of intelligence was one method of convincing a person of his or her own social worth.

Karier goes on to state:

> There is, perhaps, no stronger social class stabilizer, if not tranquilizer, within a hierarchically ordered social class system than the belief, on the part of the lower class, that their place in life is really not arbitrarily determined by privilege, status, wealth and power, but is a consequence of merit, fairly derived.

Although he later disavowed the racist conclusions of his 1923 study, A Study of American Intelligence, Carl Bringham developed the Scholastic Aptitude (now achievement) Test (SAT), which dominates the field of college entrance exams. Bringham divided the ethnic stock of America into Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean, and Negro categories. Nordic stock originated in countries such as Sweden, Norway, and England; Alpine stock came from countries such as Romania, Austria, and Hungary; and

Mediterranean stock came from areas such as Italy, Greece, and Spain. According to Bringham's analysis of the Alpha and Beta tests, Nordic groups were intellectually superior to Alpine and Mediterranean groups; Alpines were superior to Mediterraneans; and Mediterraneans were superior to Negroes. Bringham was concerned that the intermixture of these ethnic groups would cause a decline in the general level of American intelligence and concluded the same as Herrnstein and Murray: "According to all evidence available, American intelligence is declining and this decline will proceed with an accelerating rate as the racial admixture becomes more and more extensive."

Thus, as the use of tests spread through the schools, serving to separate students into different curricular groups, the tests also served the purpose of reinforcing ethnic and social class differences. For educators who adhered to the arguments of the psychologists, it appeared natural to channel children from lower economic and social groups into vocational education and those from upper social groups into the college preparatory courses. Key to all of this, in fact, was the allegedly scientific nature of the tests which gave an air of objectivity to ethnic and social class bias. In the eyes of the leaders of the measurement movement who promulgated a doctrine of native intelligence, the role of the school was to build correct social attitudes, select individuals for their places in society, and educate them for those places. Herrnstein and Murray are particularly clear in their agenda and its links to the ideas of Terman, Thorndike, and Goddard. In some ways they are just a little more genteel in their discussion of the issue.

By now it is clear to you that I.Q. is a suspect construct at best. Now let's turn our attention to an equally suspect construct, race.

The biological sciences and anthropology have long acknowledged (even though they too were responsible for the original lies) that race is not a biological or scientific term and yet we continue to see it used in academic work. Herrnstein and Murray are aware of this and stray for a while from using it, and use the term ethnic group through some of their writing. However, at one point in discussing I.Q., Jews, and Latinos they regress to the phrase "racial stock," and frequently talk of Blacks, Whites, Asians and others as "racial groups".

Let's look at the evolution of this notion. About one fact of cardinal importance practically all scientists agree. All humans belong to a single species, and there are no divisions between any varieties of people like those barriers which separate the species of animals. All humans can mate, have offspring, regardless of geographic origin, color or other differences. The superficial characteristics of skin color, eye, nose and lip shape have no correlates with our deep features - tissues, blood, organ structure - and no link to our human-ness. Race, as defined by skin color, is no more a biological entity than is a nation, whose identity depends only on a brief shared history.

Nonetheless we see a decided preoccupation again in Western science with the categorization of man, starting with the Swedish naturalist Linnaeus who in 1738 coined the term Homo sapien (homo for man, sapiens for wise; a descriptor which we may not, given the conduct of his work, assign to him and those of his cohorts). Linnaeus, observing that not all men looked alike, divided the human species into 4 varieties and attached characteristics:

Americus (American Indian) - tenacious, contented, free, ruled by custom

Europaeus (European) - light, lively, inventive, ruled by rites

Asiaticus (Asian) - stern, haughty, stingy, ruled by opinion

Afer (African) - cunning, slow, negligent, ruled by caprice (which means no rules)

A little later, 1775, another European, German scholar Blumenbach (founder of anthropology, the study of man) proposed to divide men according to skin color into five varieties and to each of these varieties was given the name "race" a term which had been employed earlier by the French scientist Buffon. The 5 races of Blumenbach were:

Caucasian or white - Blumenbach who coined this term was glad to show where his sympathies lay. Part of his definition of this group was "the most beautiful race of men..."

Mongolian or yellow

Ethiopian or black

American or red

Malayan or brown

Other anthropologists thought that skin color was too superficial a trait and they resorted to measurements of parts and proportions of the body, particularly the head. The use of such methods led to a great multiplication of races. Deniker in 1889 recognized 29 of them distinguished by hair form, with skin color and nose shape as subsidiary traits. In 1933, von Eickstedt set up 3 basic races, "Europid, Negrid, Mongolid" with 18 subraces, 3 collateral races, 11 collateral subraces and 3 intermediate forms. In 1950, the American anthropologists Coon, Garn and Birdsell, recognized 6 "puative stocks" - Negroid, Mongoloid, White, Australoid, American Indian, and Polynesian - and 30 different races.

You see not science in these convoluted engagements of turn of the century white males, maybe poetics but not science (unless we can say that each is the same). Indeed, British **geneticist** Steve Jones states in his recent book, The Language of Genes:

> Although people from different parts of the world differ from each other, the idea of pure races is a myth. Much of the story of the genetics of race - a field promoted by some of the most eminent scientists of their day - turns out to have been **prejudice dressed up as science**, a classic example of the way biology should not be used to help us understand ourselves.

It is interesting to note that Jones, a geneticist, argues against any relationship being posited about I.Q. and genes. Herrnstein and Murray, **social scientists,** argue in their book for this determinism. It is important that you hear Jones' explanation in its *entirety*. States Jones:

> Much of the work on inherited differences in intellect between the races is contemptible and most of the rest is wrong. The wrong argument usually goes like this. Blacks do less well than whites on IQ tests, so they are less intelligent. The I.Q. scores of parents and children are similar, so that intelligence is controlled by the genes. The difference between blacks and whites must therefore be genetic.
>
> This argument is deceptively simple. It has been used in the U.S. as an excuse not to spend money on black education, and a variant of the theory, which sees working class rather than black children as the victims of their genes, is often employed in Britain by those who resent spending money on state education. **Simple though it may be it is utterly false.**

I have no idea whether I.Q. tests are an unbiased measure of intelligence; what they measure is, I hope, known to those who design them. The similarity of parents and children in an ability to do the test does not in itself tell us much, as families share the same environments as well as the same genes. New twin studies do suggest that there is an inherited component in I.Q. Some claim that as much as 70% of the variation in I.Q. score within a population is due to variation in its genes. This figure seems high, but can be accepted for the present. At first sight it looks like powerful evidence for the view that any racial differences in IQ must be biologically programmed.

In fact it has no relevance to understanding whether differences in intelligence - if they exist - between races are inborn or acquired. The reason why can be seen by looking at some other characters which show racial differences. In the United States, the blood pressure of middle-aged black men is about 15 percentage points higher than that of whites. Twin studies show that about more than half the variation in blood pressure is due to genetic variation. The figures for the blood pressure story look remarkably like those for IQ, although in this case it is blacks who score higher.

Doctors and educationists have a subtle difference in world view when faced with figures like these. Doctors are optimists. They concentrate on the environment... (what has contributed to this manifestation, how it was created and sustained through diet, stress, poverty, lack of access to health care and the like). In the U.S., optimism has paid off. High blood pressure and heart disease among blacks is less of a problem than it was.

Many educationists are less hopeful. (*This is ironic that as educators we are supposed to be the people who most believe in the malleability of people*). To them, the existence of inherited variation in intelligences means that there is no point in trying to improve things by changing the environment. Blacks, they say, have worse genes. These cannot be altered, so that it is futile to spend money on better schools. In some countries, their theory has been proved wrong. **Over the past twenty years the IQ score of Japanese children has risen to more than ten points higher than that of Americans. Not even the most radical hereditarian (as are Herrnstein and Murray) claims that this is due to a sudden burst of genetic change in Japan.** Instead schools are getting better. [parenthetical remarks added to Jones' text]

> Both genetical and environmentalist views of blood pressure or IQ are naive. Characters like these are shaped by both gene and environment so that it is meaningless to ask about genetic differences except in a population living in the same conditions. I once did a simple experiment with a group of students. I divided them on the basis of hair color. The fair haired group was sent downstairs for coffee. The other set measured their own resting blood pressure. I then summoned the coffee drinkers, who took their blood pressures. Not suprisingly, as they had just run up stairs and drunk coffee their average score was higher than that of the dark haired students. There was an association between blood pressure and hair color.
>
> To many of the students this made it obvious that there was a genetic difference in blood pressure between dark and fair haired people. Only when let into the simple secret of the differences in exercise and caffeine consumption between the groups was it obvious what is wrong. The students made the same mistake as the educationists. High heritability of a character combined with a difference in its value between groups need not say anything about genes. **The race and IQ story is largely one of a dismal failure to understand basic biology.**
>
> A belief in heredity, rather like a belief in predestination, is a good excuse for doing nothing. At least the environmentalist version can be used to try to improve things. The genetic view is usually a chance of blaming the victim, a way of excusing injustice because it is determined by nature.
>
> **The argument about nature and nurture is of more than merely scientific or medical interest. It has been rehearsed endlessly by those with one or the other political ax to grind. As much of early genetics used an ax sharpened on the fires of Social Darwinism it has often been used to justify injustice.**

The goal of this final section is to illuminate how educational research can be interpreted to affect school policies and practices. As Beverly Gordon illuminates:

> It is the intent here to initiate a change in the fundamental metaphor through which we view Black children in school. Those children who fail should not necessarily be viewed as either deficient or precocious, but rather as normal children responding to a detrimental and debilitating situation. Changing such a metaphor will have social and economic as well as political implications for society at large and for the Black community within. Changing the metaphor will of course be difficult, **not**

> because of the scarcity of collaborative evidence in data, but because of the racial assumptions, beliefs, needs, fears and hatreds that are ingrained in the cultural fiber of America.
>
> One of the prevailing arguments in educational theory states that Black Children do poorly in academic endeavors and experience behavioral problems because of cognitive and cultural deficiencies in their physical and social environments. This argument, grounded in the assumption of inferiority, has historical and ideological roots. Researchers attempted to explain, over and over again, why children were predisposed to academic failure in public schooling.
>
> Arguments in the academic and pyschological communities about the validity of such tests were, and still are, continuous; nonetheless, the low performance of Black children on these tests provides ammunition for those who argue that Blacks are intellectually inferior.

In an effort to understand and shed some light on this controversial subject, inquiry was conducted on the study of the mental and motor development of both Black and White infants. Pasamanick (1946), breaking with predominant thought, reported in his study of Black and White babies that Black babies were inherently more precocious in their motor coordination than White babies. Later, in a subsequent study Knobloch and Pasamanick (1953) found superior development of Black babies in various stages of development in contrast to comparative White groups.

In 1954, a French pediatrician, Marcelle Gerber, an expert in infant testing, began to study a type of malnutrition in Ugandan neophytes. Instead of observing malnutrition, which Gerber learned did not manifest itself until after weaning, Gerber discovered that African infants during their first year of life were "precocious" in their psycho-motor development. Using the Gesell tests and a test for newborns she writes, "The results of the tests showed an all round advance of development over European standards... The precocity was not only in motor development, it was found in intellectual development also." Gerber continues:

> Although most of the African children had never seen anything resembling the test material, they used it in the same way as European children and

> succeeded in the tests earlier than those children. Their interest was lively, and their personal-social relations excellent. They made very good contact with the tester, turning and "talking" to her, smiling at her, and trying in every way to communicate with her.

Bayley (1965) did an extensive study of 1,409 American infants between the ages of 1 to 15 months. Though, contrary to her predecessors, she found no differences in the mean scores on mental scales between Black and White babies, she did find Black babies to be more precocious than White babies in motor development. Walters (1967) in her study of the development of Black and White infants in Florida using the Gesell Test, found Black babies to be stronger and more advanced in total development than their White counterparts even when she controlled for socioeconomic variables. More recently, Konner (1977) in his study of Kung San! infants using Einstein scales of sensorimotor development, found evidence which supports previous research findings that African infants are more advanced in their cognitive and motor development than White American infants. Further, it has been general knowledge in the medical world, particularly in obstetrics, that Black babies have higher APGAR scores at birth that their White peers.

From this research on the psychomotor development, two points can be made. First, there is an obvious need for more research on the phenomenon of precocity in Black children. Second, the politics of such research poses an interesting dilemma since it provides strong evidence in opposition to the notion of Black inferiority. There is, after all, the real possibility that through careful scrutiny, researchers could find what this society prefers not to discuss.

Finally, I leave you with the words of the American Anthropological Association's Resolution 16 written November 1969 in response to Jensen's (an associate of Herrnstein's), proclamations about race and IQ:

> Whereas the question of racism continues to represent a clear and present danger to the proper scientific understanding of mankind, be it resolved that the American Anthropological Association...requests all members of the profession upon their return home to use all available outlets in the national and local media to inform the general public concerning the correct facts about the nature of human variability.

I implore you to continue to do the same. Read and study. Do not permit yourself to become entrapped in legends and myths. Read and then record your dissent. Your charge as scholars....

In history - read John Henrik Clarke, Anthony Browder's Nile Valley Contributions to Civilization; Yosef-ben-Jochannan; DuBois' The World and Africa; The Constitution and Declaration of Independence; study Marcus Garvey, Thurgood Marshall and Charles Houston.

In science study genetics, read Steve Jones' The Language of Genes; Dobzansky and Dunn's Heredity, Race and Society; study reproductive technology and the political reasons behind this endeavor.

In literature, read liberatory works that expose and critique. Check out James Baldwin's The Price of the Ticket (his nonfictional essays).

In education and psychology read Asa Hilliard; and Adolf Reed, Jr.; deconstruct IQ; read Howard Gardner's Frames of the Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences; and Yale's Robert Sternberg's Beyond IQ; read Beverly Gordon's *Journal of Education* article, "Toward a Theory of Knowledge Acquisition for Black Children", read Paulo Friere's Pedagogy of the Oppressed; Steven Gould's Mismeasure of Man; Leon Kamin's The Bell Curve Debate; bell hooks; and Frederick Douglass.

In religious studies understand the principles of the ancient Kemetic spiritual system MAT, especially retribution and harmony; dissect the imagery of good and evil; the presentation of God, Jesus, the saints (in Christian tradition); read the Metu Neter and The Book of Coming Forta By Day, read Na'im Akbar's Chains and Images of Psychological Slavery; read Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian scripts, listen to the Koran, Bible and Torah's teachings.

In math - first learn math, upper level math; become efficient in the language of statistics, its use and misuse and inherent subjectivities; use math to seek truth, study the pyramids and astronomy; check out theoretical physics and chaos theory.

In political science and economics - look at the racialization of laws; know history and the intersection of it with social, political, economic and cultural orders; understand the

Trilateral Commission, the G-7, Wall Street, the Tokyo market, the economics of the prison industry; Africa and the Cold War; read Haki Madhubuti's Plan to Planet.

In anthropology - understand the Germanic notion of kultur (CULTURE); study humanity's origins and migrations; study Boas; the melanin scientists; read Welsing.

In music - study jazz theory and its utility for deconstructing and dealing with this madness.

In physical education - know the history and conduct of the original Olympics had nothing to do with what could be accomplished on ice and snow with machinery; teach us how to reconnect the body to the mind and spirit.

In communications, mass media and journalism - counter the negative images; study the philosophy and works of Howard University professor Haile Gerima, see his film SANKOFA.

Above all read as many western classics as you can Aristotle, Plato, Hitler's Mein Kampf, study Jensen and Shockley to know the battle's terrain.

To my esteemed colleagues on the faculty of Stillman College challenge the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Council for Anthropology and Education (CAE) and the other professional and scholarly organizations to which you belong to denounce this persistent line of inquiry as unscientific and anti democratic.

Recall that Proverbs admonishes...in all thy knowledge gain thee an understanding. And remember as Frederick Douglass (and yes even Thomas Jefferson) said, "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance." Scholarship **is** part of the struggle. The Bible and your college seal proclaim, "You Shall Know The Truth, and The Truth Shall Set You Free."

Be vigilant, true seekers...on this your ancestors and progeny depend!